DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 536 UD 023 912

TITLE The Impact of Reductions in Federal Education Expenditures: CUBE Ad Hoc Committee Report.
INSTITUTION National School Boards Association, Washington, DC. Council of Urban Boards of Education.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 25p.; Some pages may not reproduce clearly due to small or light print.
PUB TYPE Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Finance; Elementary Secondary Education; Expenditures; *Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; *Government Role; *Retrenchment; Surveys; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

The Council of Urban Boards of Education (CUBE) created an ad hoc study committee to research the effects of Federal program reductions on the urban school districts that are members of the Council. A survey instrument was developed and disseminated by the committee for the following purposes: (1) to determine the current trends in Federal expenditures; (2) to identify Federal program reductions and the impact of those reductions; (3) to examine techniques and strategies being developed or implemented to address the issue; and (4) to report the results of the research to the educational community and public. Thirty-nine CUBE member districts responded to the survey. From these responses data were tabulated on such key issues as funding trends, revenue sources, rising budgetary expenditures, strategies and techniques for addressing reductions, and perceptions of the Federal role in education funding. This report, which summarizes survey findings, has been designed to serve as a reference guide for school board members and other who wish to assess the financial status of Federally-funded education programs in selected urban school systems. (Author/KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED251536

NSBA

SERVING AMERICAN EDUCATION THROUGH SCHOOL BOARD LEADERSHIP

CUBE Ad Hoc Committee

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra Henningberg

NSBA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

The Impact of Reductions in Federal Education Expenditures

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

UD023912

OVERVIEW

In 1981, the prospects for substantial reductions in federally funded education programs were faced by urban school boards. This new federal policy thrust seemed to indicate that an overwhelming number of urban school systems would have to cut or eliminate necessary and effective programs. All who witnessed these events tended to conclude that cutbacks in such needed programs as ECIA Chapter 1, education for handicapped students, impact aid and school nutrition would place urban school boards in the arduous decision-making position of decreasing or even eliminating services. Congress did not totally support this effort and some funding was minimally reinstated. However, urban school systems still found themselves in a position of trying to do more with less. Moreover, it was clear from the outset that these systems would be disproportionately hurt by these types of cuts in federal aid.

The NSBA Council of Urban Boards of Education (CUBE) created an ad hoc study committee to research the effects of federal program reductions on the urban school districts that are members of the Council. A survey instrument was developed and disseminated by the committee for the following purposes:

- to determine the current trends in federal expenditures;
- to identify federal program reductions and the impact of those reductions;
- to examine techniques and strategies being developed or implemented to address the issue; and
- to report the results of the research to the educational community and public.

Thirty-nine (55%) CUBE member districts responded to the survey.* From these responses data was tabulated on such key issues as funding trends, revenue sources, rising budgetary expenditures, strategies and techniques for addressing reductions and perceptions of the federal role in education funding.

This report has been specifically designed as a convenient reference guide. It is intended to assist school board members and others in quickly assessing the financial status of federally-funded education programs in selected urban school systems.

We hope that you will find *The Impact of Reductions in Federal Education Expenditures* an informative and useful publication.

Very truly yours,

Thomas A. Shannon
Executive Director

Responses from two districts were received after the deadline. Their data is reported in the appendix.

IMPACT AID

Funding for Impact Aid, Parts A and B, has declined over the last four years. Twenty-nine (74%) of the urban school districts received less monies in 1982-83. Cuts were severe: fifteen districts lost at least three-quarters of their funding for this program.

Funding Levels for IMPACT AID, PARTS A and B

City	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Relative Change Between 1979-80 and 1982-83
Anchorage, AK	3,953,900	1,704,200	368,900	268,900	(93)
Aurora, CO	NR	661,063	289,621	266,734	(60)'
Baton Rouge, LA	112,579	70,22-	NR	6,482	(94)
Birmingham, AL	702,200	157,480	NR	163,675	(77)
Boston, MA	491,500	—0—	NR	189,060	(62)
Cedar Rapids, IA	—0—	—0—	NR	—0—	NA
Chicago, IL	3,648,742	3,234,932	NR	852,902	(77)
Dallas, TX	—0—	—0—	NR	1,094,640	NA
Dayton, OH	—0—	—0—	NR	—0—	NA
Denver, CO	2,589,749	2,288,944	NR	1,297,212	(50)
Detroit, MI	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
Flint, Mi	84,718	96,800	NR	12,745	(85)
Fort Wayne, IN	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
Fresno, CA	202,670	157,568	NR	40,187	(80)
Indianapolis, IN	133,242	161,866	—0—	41,516	(69)
Jacksonville, FL	3,418,439	3,181,202	1,489,173	2,739,202	(20)
Lincoln, NE	227,806	154,182	36,487	24,667	(89)
Memphis, TN	780,242	158,728	241,618	223,091	(71)
Miami, FL	2,028,045	2,961,885	1,338,741	2,098,227	4
Milwaukee, WI	246,824	536,520	NR	65,064	(74)
Newark, NJ	641,157	1,561,457	NR	131,947	(79)
New York, NY	25,900,000	20,800,000	3,200,000	7,200,000	(72)
Norfolk, VA	4,568,570	3,966,640	2,368,820	4,216,587	(8)
Omaha, NE	390,000	658,000	102,000	74,000	(81)
Orlando, FL	1,351,877	1,164,376	690,371	1,046,565	(23)
Pittsburgh, PA	1,119,051	247,480	598,283	11,000	(99)
Portland, OR	205,000	144,144	33,153	27,191	(87)
Portsmouth, VA	1,217,000	873,622	801,407	336,500	(72)
Reno, NV	147,398	637,234	NR	384,638	161
Rochester, NY	35,603	226,698	123,829	120,170	238
San Diego, CA	14,659,767	13,104,910	NR	10,043,507	(32)
San Francisco, CA	7,890,631	8,601,130	10,000,000	9,008,036	14
Seattle, WA	243,505	198,553	258,040	186,508	(23)
Springfield, MO	97,088	51,637	30,153	20,104	(79)
Tacoma, WA	434,911	331,280	165,446	193,440	(56)
Tucson, AZ	1,414,397	1,383,745	NR	916,487	(35)
Tulsa, OK	223,209	241,366	39,804	34,303	(85)
Virginia Beach, VA	5,731,797	6,738,042	NR	6,809,548	19
Wichita, KS	617,000	453,300	189,000	86,600	(86)

'Change between 1980-81 and 1982-83

FUNDING TRENDS / REVENUE SOURCES

ECIA Chapter 1

ECIA Chapter 1 dollars decreased in 27 (69%) of the school districts responding to the survey. Proportional losses ranged from less than 1% to 28% of 1979-80 funding levels, with the average decline being 16%. Conversely, of those districts with more ECIA Chapter 1 monies in 1982-83 (12 districts), half had increases of 5% or less.

Funding Levels for ECIA Chapter 1 (ESEA-1)

City	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Relative Change Between 1979-80 and 1982-83
Anchorage, AK	1,085,300	1,083,800	1,132,800	923,700	(15)
Aurora, CO	NR	449,307	431,759	473,523	5[1]
Baton Rouge, LA	3,609,383	3,809,864	NR	3,474,055	(4)
Birmingham, AL	5,754,137	5,640,812	NR	5,877,148	2
Boston, MA	10,039,637	12,491,867	NR	10,160,082	1
Cedar Rapids, IA	754,417	735,277	NR	591,770	(22)
Chicago, IL	71,806,744	64,633,379	NR	64,083,980	(11)
Dallas, TX	10,562,541	10,743,344	NR	9,256,343	(12)
Dayton, OH	3,500,000	4,438,000	NR	3,322,166	(5)
Denver, CO	6,523,767	6,582,087	NR	6,051,132	(7)
Detroit, MI	38,300,000	36,700,000	32,800,000	31,400,000	(18)
Flint, MI	3,163,810	5,344,878	NR	4,218,156	33
Fort Wayne, IN	1,139,834	1,116,441	1,124,897	1,202,713	6
Fresno, CA	6,241,735	6,702,706	NR	5,376,370	(14)
Indianapolis, IN	5,499,084	5,170,475	4,573,572	4,063,906	(26)
Jacksonville, FL	10,482,568	9,484,469	7,214,472	7,760,965	(26)
Lincoln, NE	869,180	857,395	990,940	687,836	(21)
Memphis, TN	11,283,486	12,763,580	12,274,871	11,295,290	(1)
Miami, FL	13,698,325	14,532,613	14,423,229	13,444,664	(2)
Milwaukee, WI	11,435,857	14,430,316	NR	8,430,238	(26)
Newark, NJ	12,988,067	14,179,721	NR	13,718,953	6
New York, NY	171,000,000	138,800,000	158,800,000	177,900,000	4
Norfolk, VA	4,458,361	5,384,745	5,685,100	3,767,344	(16)
Omaha, NE	2,985,000	2,776,000	2,438,000	2,533,000	(15)
Orlando, FL	5,991,871	4,898,793	1,693,064	5,146,162	(14)
Pittsburgh, PA	9,101,360	8,540,200	8,445,709	6,995,975	(24)
Portland, OR	5,250,681	5,267,707	4,557,116	3,776,932	(28)
Portsmouth, VA	1,998,414	2,064,783	1,498,196	1,456,283	(27)
Reno, NV	584,659	636,135	NR	629,151	8
Rochester, NY	5,309,941	5,141,174	4,166,942	4,003,191	(25)
San Diego, CA	7,715,218	8,590,814	NR	9,697,555	20
San Francisco, CA	7,661,046	8,175,078	8,700,000	6,715,657	(12)
Seattle, WA	3,451,752	4,207,826	2,549,200	3,465,740	<1
Springfield, MO	492,686	424,841	797,969	1,056,405	114
Tacoma, WA	1,628,400	1,801,050	1,623,421	1,535,986	(6)
Tucson, AZ	3,110,063	2,990,514	NR	2,329,953	(25)
Tulsa, OK	3,010,124	3,140,767	3,589,540	2,470,431	(18)
Virginia Beach, VA	1,967,124	1,927,899	NR	1,970,456	<1
Wichita, KS	2,535,825	2,560,834	2,339,518	2,187,051	(14)

[1]Change between 1980-81 and 1982-83

EDUCATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Funds for the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), increased in 27 (69%) of the school districts. Increases ranged from 2% in three districts to nearly 300% in one urban school district. The average rise in funding was 54%.

Funding Levels for Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142)

City	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Relative Change Between 1979-80 and 1982-83
Anchorage, AK	219,700	384,500	738,300	549,900	150
Aurora, CO	NR	330,349	312,467	363,388	10'
Baton Rouge, LA	876,400	974,032	NR	1,103,137	26
Birmingham, AL	947,175	921,206	NR	961,075	2
Boston, MA	1,694,319	7,019,006	NR	2,068,365	22
Cedar Rapids, IA	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
Chicago, IL	9,119,996	10,460,884	NR	9,328,290	2
Dallas, TX	688,752	2,858,119	NR	1,192,421	73
Dayton, OH	315,927	359,000	NR	588,600	86
Denver, CO	580,199	847,553	NR	940,958	62
Detroit, MI	2,800,000	3,000,000	2,600,000	2,800,000	0
Flint, MI	490,542	317,883	NR	631,300	29
Fort Wayne, IN	822,299	843,133	646,399	647,930	(21)
Fresno, CA	1,191,400	633,200	NR	838,446	(30)
Indianapolis, IN	1,570,335	1,266,694	1,336,200	1,360,790	(13)
Jacksonville, FL	*	1,494,560	2,504,455	2,494,988	70'
Lincoln, NE	229,016	558,660	923,702	903,883	295
Memphis, TN	2,105,733	2,177,942	1,848,150	1,820,685	(14)
Miami, FL	2,445,182	6,305,148	3,497,406	4,108,577	68
Milwaukee, WI	1,709,341	2,673,053	NR	2,097,395	23
Newark, NJ	1,050,437	1,349,370	NR	1,308,570	25
New York, NY	13,200,000	8,300,000	13,100,000	23,200,000	76
Norfolk, VA	699,179	1,217,622	1,107,036	1,146,711	64
Omaha, NE	1,103,000	1,030,000	1,405,000	1,526,000	38
Orlando, FL	858,196	1,153,992	2,507,720	2,075,080	142
Pittsburgh, PA	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
Portland, OR	887,173	1,275,590	1,269,658	1,496,539	41
Portsmouth, VA	216,334	247,154	282,546	329,175	52
Reno, NV	365,125	465,748	NR	352,653	(3)
Rochester, NY	907,571	1,194,238	794,856	823,520	(9)
San Diego, CA	2,524,944	1,659,549	NR	2,204,314	(13)
San Francisco, CA	763,623	566,027	940,000	947,244	24
Seattle, WA	681,917	921,881	733,116	807,855	18
Springfield, MO	619,490	445,046	459,539	449,301	(28)
Tacoma, WA	556,215	614,388	686,414	719,487	29
Tucson, AZ	932,704	1,035,362	NR	819,610	(12)
Tulsa, OK	697,950	820,770	99,257	1,031,338	48
Virginia Beach, VA	436,877	1,567,674	NR	837,983	92
Wichita, KS	750,000	750,000	733,000	765,600	2

*Funds included in ECIA Chapter 1 amount
'Change between 1980-81 and 1982-83

The School Nutrition Program

The School Lunch Program fared somewhat better over the four-year period than did other federal programs. Seventy-seven percent of the school districts showed increased funding levels, although almost a third of these districts increased their monies by 5% or less.

Funding Levels for School Lunch

City	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Relative Change Between 1979-80 and 1982-83
Anchorage, AK	1,509,000	1,693,100	1,531,200	1,442,200	(4)
Aurora, CO	NR	359,121	592,454	703,430	96[1]
Baton Rouge, LA	5,668,056	6,029,425	NR	5,684,874	1
Birmingham, AL	6,067,644	6,219,330	NR	7,019,478	16
Boston, MA	7,901,262	7,901,267	NR	8,153,945	3
Cedar Rapids, IA	766,175	884,945	NR	858,895	12
Chicago, IL	54,746,000	58,466,000	NR	66,754,081	22
Dallas, TX	11,416,744	13,567,359	NR	13,589,184	19
Dayton, OH	5,926,000	6,681,000	NR	8,815,000	49
Denver, CO	4,954,207	5,476,369	NR	5,182,898	5
Detroit, MI	24,200,000	24,000,000	23,600,000	22,800,000	(6)
Flint, MI	2,237,047	2,550,169	NR	2,357,435	5
Fort Wayne, IN	1,537,291	1,828,604	1,868,083	1,930,624	26
Fresno, CA	3,211,704	3,727,491	NR	4,830,353	50
Indianapolis, IN	4,996,866	5,910,626	4,507,099	5,457,103	9
Jacksonville, FL	10,183,035	10,874,358	11,130,906	11,399,617	12
Lincoln, NE	943,870	1,083,599	829,340	912,870	(3)
Memphis, TN	14,838,843	16,899,038	12,642,478	15,943,587	7
Miami, FL	26,428,521	28,545,411	27,264,248	29,754,936	13
Milwaukee, WI	6,597,101	2,073,582	NR	2,181,117	(67)
Newark, NJ	8,898,644	8,778,087	NR	9,740,566	10
New York, NY	117,400,000	121,100,000	123,400,000	131,600,000	12
Norfolk, VA	3,726,760	4,253,803	4,092,879	4,427,780	19
Omaha, NE	3,271,000	3,532,000	3,002,000	3,320,000	2
Orlando, FL	5,842,785	6,058,743	5,233,999	6,188,523	6
Pittsburgh, PA	4,464,878	4,617,936	4,264,644	4,558,712	2
Portland, OR	2,875,000	2,708,087	2,801,593	3,400,000	21
Portsmouth, VA	1,513,792	1,710,898	1,703,682	1,819,202	20
Reno, NV	1,038,230	1,114,428	NR	1,166,115	12
Rochester, NY	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
San Diego, CA	732,148	738,557	NR	754,043	3
San Francisco	6,260,000	5,960,000	6,600,000	6,530,000	4
Seattle, WA	2,426,410	3,358,733	2,375,312	3,928,326	62
Springfield, MO	1,044,814	1,119,200	818,238	915,639	(12)
Tacoma, WA	3,134,414	3,308,972	2,594,948	3,204,172	2
Tucson, AZ	5,911,403	6,698,704	NR	5,675,469	(4)
Tulsa, OK	2,582,851	2,598,431	NR	2,507,534	(3)
Virginia Beach, VA	1,976,602	1,987,372	NR	1,712,429	(13)
Wichita, KS	2,500,000	2,530,000	2,200,000	2,670,000	7

[1]Change between 1980-81 and 1982-83

Vocational Education

In more than half (20) of the school districts, 1982-83 Vocational Education funding levels were lower than four years previously. The average decrease was 29%. Seventeen school districts evinced higher funding levels for Vocational Education programs, three of whom more than doubled their funds. The remaining 14 had gains ranging from 3% to 65%.

Funding Levels for Vocational Education

City	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Relative Change Between 1979-80 and 1982-83
Anchorage, AK	106,000	114,600	53,700	54,500	(49)
Aurora, CO	NR	173,652	100,958	146,035	(16)'
Baton Rouge, LA	313,331	345,865	NR	144,019	(54)
Birmingham, AL	642,505	636,843	NR	499,944	(22)
Boston, MA	1,476,430	1,651,136	NR	1,068,915	(28)
Cedar Rapids, IA	88,578	98,661	NR	76,066	(16)
Chicago, IL	527,000	2,529,000	NR	2,999,005	469
Dallas, TX	1,410,050	3,046,717	NR	2,304,898	64
Dayton, OH	1,500,000	1,510,000	NR	1,151,000	(23)
Denver, CO	468,048	415,243	NR	406,260	(13)
Detroit, MI	1,000,000	1,300,000	800,000	900,000	(10)
Flint, MI	305,159	804,549	NR	730,304	139
Fort Wayne, IN	137,560	178,730	265,413	191,057	39
Fresno, CA	337,425	550,361	NR	427,466	27
Indianapolis, IN	346,378	471,970	472,489	356,730	(3)
Jacksonville, FL	584,530	754,781	728,920	675,722	16
Lincoln, NE	382,312	428,065	362,227	478,257	25
Memphis, TN	1,867,285	2,116,202	1,476,926	2,094,904	12
Miami, FL	1,415,914	1,546,892	1,669,307	1,856,907	31
Milwaukee, WI	463,321	548,014	NR	221,595	(52)
Newark, NJ	212,149	261,319	NR	112,656	(47)
New York, NY	15,600,000	10,100,000	15,500,000	14,700,000	(6)
Norfolk, VA	1,245,235	1,640,303	1,004,184	630,007	(49)
Omaha, NE	394,000	415,000	390,000	407,000	3
Orlando, FL	595,408	557,364	999,920	584,315	(2)
Pittsburgh, PA	1,792,997	2,060,051	2,219,006	2,251,624	26
Portland, OR	564,570	532,167	466,399	586,399	4
Portsmouth, VA	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	N/A
Reno, NV	280,000	289,000	NR	197,119	(30)
Rochester, NY	1,790,095	1,380,452	1,221,795	859,290	(52)
San Diego, CA	528,562	571,532	NR	670,530	27
San Francisco, CA	614,087	738,893	890,000	660,840	8
Seattle, WA	83,297	86,956	109,940	129,607	56
Springfield, MO	353,902	219,547	328,772	260,074	(26)
Tacoma, WA	240,289	400,091	625,269	549,906	129
Tucson, AZ	566,959	557,946	NR	412,487	(27)
Tulsa, OK	N/A	N/A	NR	242,031	N/A
Virginia Beach, VA	312,794	317,668	NR	134,101	(57)
Wichita, KS	239,000	278,000	239,000	395,000	65

'Change between 1980-81 and 1982-83

Other Federal Programs

Funding for "other" federal programs increased in 15 districts and decreased in 17. Seven respondents had no federal dollars for "other" programs. Although these federal monies were not broken down into program categories, in the Ad Hoc Committee members' districts, from which more detailed information was obtained, typical programs include: Adult Basic Education, Bilingual Education, ESAA, Headstart, and CETA.

Funding Levels for "Other" Federal Programs

City	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Relative Change Between 1979-80 and 1982-83
Anchorage, AK	1,703,300	1,934,000	1,832,500	2,023,900	19
Aurora, CO	NR	84,428	188,937	221,599	162[1]
Baton Rouge, LA	369,089	575,978	NR	720,170	95
Birmingham, AL	852,645	1,181,034	NR	1,427,301	67
Boston, MA	6,112,341	5,419,594	NR	3,208,452	(48)
Cedar Rapids, IA	179,868	208,094	NR	372,794	107
Chicago, IL	25,138,518	20,513,805	NR	36,075,273	43
Dallas, TX	3,692,808	8,023,588	NR	4,250,816	15
Dayton, OH	—0—	—0—	NR	—0—	NA
Denver, CO	78,483	80,353	NR	114,656	46
Detroit, MI	2,700,000	3,000,000	3,100,000	2,900,000	7
Flint, MI	1,360,182	4,137,668	NR	1,764,574	30
Fort Wayne, IN	974,815	996,340	970,763	818,133	(16)
Fresno, CA	1,733,323	2,476,328	NR	1,414,508	(18)
Indianapolis, IN	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
Jacksonville, FL	2,069,734	2,093,218	1,751,712	1,396,869	(32)
Lincoln, NE	1,221,282	1,345,856	1,207,511	966,047	(21)
Memphis, TN	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
Miami, FL	23,723,122	24,766,461	19,212,567	20,0[illegible]	(16)
Milwaukee, WI	10,488,812	10,713,617	NR	7,35[illegible]	(30)
Newark, NJ	3,988,217	3,209,218	NR	1,646,228	(59)
New York, NY	21,200,000	26,900,000	43,100,000	27,100,000	28
Norfolk, VA	846,781	846,097	767,411	1,143,985	26
Omaha, NE	2,900,000	2,226,000	1,387,000	872,000	(70)
Orlando, FL	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
Pittsburgh, PA	6,719,701	6,993,310	5,443,814	5,087,743	(24)
Portland, OR	5,336,835	5,256,197	3,767,712	2,862,027	(46)
Portsmouth, VA	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
Reno, VA	532,959	492,661	NR	472,986	(11)
Rochester, NY	4,611,652	6,260,658	2,397,901	2,451,242	(47)
San Diego, CA	10,534,965	8,465,037	NR	2,532,576	(76)
San Francisco, CA	—0—	—0—	—0—	—0—	NA
Seattle, WA	14,296,908	14,486,946	8,297,327	5,074,192	(64)
Springfield, MO	545,244	746,118	703,472	631,[illegible]	16
Tacoma, WA	3,684,094	3,383,484	3,182,028	2,110,192	(43)
Tucson, AZ	—0—	—0—	NR	—0—	NA
Tulsa, OK	672,192	596,190	NR	908,678	35
Virginia Beach, VA	76,411	85,000	NR	69,000	(10)
Wichita, KS	1,300,000	1,900,000	1,515,000	1,515,000	16

[1]Change between 1980-81 and 1982-83

Revenue Sources

Federal funding cuts are the harsh reality in urban school districts. In 34 of the 39 districts described in this report, federal money constitutes a lower percentage of the 1982-83 budget than was true four years previously. The average decrease in federal funding as a percentage of urban school districts' budgets is 4%. Proportional costs borne by the federal government during 1982-83 averaged 7% of districts' total budgets.

Looking to offset fewer federal dollars, 21 urban districts received larger shares of their budgets from their states. Proportional state contributions were unchanged in 2 districts, and the remaining 41% received less state funding in comparison to other sources in 1982-83. Nineteen districts got at least half of their operating costs during 1982-83 from their respective states. Localities have picked up a greater share of educational costs in 64% of the districts.

It should be emphasized that an increase in proportional dollar allocations by state or local sources does NOT necessarily equate with more money. Real dollars from any one source may remain constant and yet constitute a greater percentage of a smaller total budget figure.

Percentage Funding by Revenue Source

City	Source	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Absolute Change Between 1979-80 and 1982-83
Anchorage, AK	Local	25.0	23.0	19.4	20.0	(5.0)
	State	68.0	72.0	77.2	78.0	10.0
	Federal	7.0	5.0	3.4	2.0	(5.0)
Aurora, CO	Local	NR	38.5	38.2	41.5	3.0'
	State	NR	60.2	61.3	58.1	(2.1)'
	Federal	NR	1.3	0.5	0.4	(0.9)'
Baton Rouge, LA	Local	38.0	37.0	NR	36.0	(2.0)
	State	53.0	54.0	NR	57.0	4.0
	Federal	9.0	9.0	NR	7.0	(2.0)
Birmingham, AL	Local	31.0	32.0	NR	29.0	(2.0)
	State	51.0	50.0	NR	56.0	5.0
	Federal	18.0	18.0	NR	15.0	(3.0)
Boston, MA	Local	43.5	51.9	NR	48.4	4.9
	State	44.9	37.7	NR	42.0	(2.9)
	Federal	11.6	10.4	NR	9.6	(2.0)
Cedar Rapids, IA	Local	47.1	47.0	NR	47.6	0.5
	State	50.6	50.8	NR	50.4	(0.2)
	Federal	2.3	2.2	NR	2.0	(0.3)
Chicago, IL	Local	31.2	34.7	NR	36.8	5.6
	State	53.0	50.7	NR	50.4	(2.6)
	Federal	15.8	14.6	NR	12.8	(3.0)
Dallas, TX	Local	55.0	56.0	NR	57.0	2.0
	State	38.0	37.0	NR	35.0	(3.0)
	Federal	7.0	7.0	NR	8.0	1.0
Dayton, OH	Local	50.0	46.0	NR	47.0	(3.0)
	State	40.0	46.0	NR	47.0	7.0
	Federal	10.0	8.0	NR	6.0	(4.0)
Denver, CO	Local	68.0	71.0	NR	70.0	2.0
	State	30.0	27.0	NR	29.0	(1.0)
	Federal	2.0	2.0	NR	1.0	(1.0)

Percentage Funding by Revenue Source (cont.)

City	Source	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Absolute Change Between 1979-80 and 1982-83
Detroit, MI	Local	28.0[2]	31.0	30.0[2]	32.0[2]	4.0
	State	53.0[2]	53.0	57.0[2]	56.0[2]	3.0
	Federal	18.0[2]	16.0	14.0[2]	11.0[2]	(7.0)
Flint, MI	Local	53.7	54.7	NR	57.1	3.4
	State	37.6	32.1	NR	33.8	(3.8)
	Federal	8.7	13.2	NR	9.1	0.4
Fort Wayne, IN	Local	42.4	43.0	NR	41.8	(0.6)
	State	57.5	56.8	NR	58.1	0.6
	Federal	0.1	0.2	NR	0.1	0.0
Fresno, CA	Local	19.5	18.7	NR	21.1	1.6
	State	71.3	72.3	NR	72.3	1.0
	Federal	9.2	9.0	NR	6.6	(2.6)
Indianapolis, IN	Local	40.0	51.0	47.0	46.0	6.0
	State	45.0	36.0	44.0	45.0	0.0
	Federal	15.0	13.0	9.0	9.0	(6.0)
Jacksonville, FL	Local	25.8	22.6	22.7	20.6	(5.2)
	State	60.4	64.2	66.5	68.4	8.0
	Federal	13.8	13.2	10.8	11.0	(2.8)
Lincoln, NE	Local	74.0	71.0	72.0	69.0	(5.0)
	State	18.0	21.0	21.0	25.0	7.0
	Federal	8.0	8.0	7.0	6.0	(2.0)
Memphis, TN	Local	50.0	50.0	52.0	52.0	2.0
	State	34.0	31.0	33.0	32.0	(2.0)
	Federal	16.0	19.0	15.0	16.0	0.0
Miami, FL	Local	34.8	31.8[2]	44.3	35.4	0.6
	State	53.5	57.3[2]	47.0	55.9	2.4
	Federal	11.7	10.8[2]	8.7	8.7	(3.0)
Milwaukee, WI	Local	42.0	43.0	NR	44.0	2.0
	State	46.0	46.0	NR	50.0	4.0
	Federal	12.0	11.0	NR	6.0	(6.0)
Newark, NJ	Local	16.7	21.7	NR	22.3	5.6
	State	66.5	56.4	NR	64.8	(1.7)
	Federal	16.8	21.9	NR	12.9	(3.9)
New York, NY	Local	49.5	48.8[2]	51.6	49.5	0.0
	State	31.9	34.5[2]	33.8	36.1	4.2
	Federal	18.6	16.9[2]	14.6	14.4	(4.2)
Norfolk, VA	Local	40.6	38.7	NR	41.0	0.4
	State	39.2	41.7	NR	43.7	4.5
	Federal	20.2	19.6	NR	15.3	(4.9)
Omaha, NE	Local	64.5	58.8	62.2	61.9	(2.6)
	State	27.2	34.3	32.6	33.3	6.1
	Federal	8.3	6.9	5.2	4.8	(3.5)
Orlando, FL	Local	30.0	33.0	31.0	32.0	2.0
	State	60.0	58.0	60.0	60.0	0.0
	Federal	10.0	9.0	9.0	8.0	(2.0)
Pittsburgh, PA	Local	47.0	53.0	54.0	55.0	8.0
	State	37.0	33.0	34.0	34.0	(3.0)
	Federal	16.0	14.0	12.0	11.0	(5.0)
Portland, OR	Local	66.6	67.1	72.6	75.8	9.2
	State	23.4	23.4	20.2	18.3	(5.1)
	Federal	10.0	9.5	7.2	5.9	(4.1)
Portsmouth, VA	Local	47.0[2]	46.0[2]	48.0[2]	45.0[2]	(2.0)[3]
	State	36.0[2]	39.0[2]	40.0[2]	44.0[2]	8.0[3]
	Federal	16.0[2]	13.0[2]	11.0[2]	9.0[2]	(7.0)[3]

Reno, NV	Local	46.8	50.9	NR	59.9	13.1
	State	52.9	48.1	NR	39.7	(13.2)
	Federal	0.3	1.0	NR	0.4	0.1
Rochester, NY	Local	34.2	28.9	29.1	56.2[2]	22.0
	State	39.7	53.9	60.1	38.1[2]	(11.6)
	Federal	16.1	17.2	10.8	5.6[2]	(10.5)
San Diego, CA	Local	29.0	33.0	NR	39.0	10.0
	State	58.0	56.0	NR	53.0	(5.0)
	Federal	13.0	11.0	NR	8.0	(5.0)
San Francisco, CA	Local	12.1	12.4	23.6	17.6	5.5[3]
	State	72.7	73.1	65.2	72.2	(0.5)[3]
	Federal	15.2	14.5	11.2	9.2	(6.0)[3]
Seattle, WA	Local	25.1	23.2	22.1	24.5	(0.6)
	State	61.4	62.5	68.3	66.9	5.5
	Federal	13.5	14.3	9.6	8.6	(4.9)
Springfield, MO	Local	58.4	56.3	56.3	58.7	0.3
	State	34.1	37.2	37.2	34.8	0.7
	Federal	7.5	6.5	6.5	6.5	(1.0)
Tacoma, WA	Local	22.8	20.4	19.7	22.4	(0.4)
	State	67.8	70.0	72.1	70.0	2.2
	Federal	9.4	9.6	8.2	7.6	(1.8)
Tucson, AZ	Local	50.9	37.0	NR	40.0	(10.9)
	State	41.3	53.5	NR	53.3	12.0
	Federal	7.8	9.5	NR	6.7	(1.1)
Tulsa, OK	Local	50.0	47.8	47.1	44.1	(5.9)
	State	45.7	46.0	50.5	52.2	6.5
	Federal	4.3	6.2	2.4	3.7	(0.6)
Virginia Beach, VA	Local	50.1	51.1	NR	54.5	4.4
	State	40.4	40.0	NR	41.1	0.7
	Federal	9.5	8.9	NR	4.4	(5.1)
Wichita, KS	Local	50.3	48.7	53.4	54.9	4.6
	State	48.7	50.7	46.1	44.9	(3.8)
	Federal	1.0	0.6	0.5	0.2	(0.8)

[1]% Change between 1980-81 and 1982-83
[2]Not equal to 100% due to rounding errors
[3]Decreases not equal to increases due to rounding errors in Table

RISING BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Fastest Growing Budget Expenditures

Budget Item	School Districts
Energy costs	28 (72%)
Health care	21 (54%)
School nutrition	1 (3%)
Administrative costs	2 (5%)
Staff (teachers', principals' salaries and benefits)	28 (72%)
Physical plant(s) maintenance	13 (33%)
Other: Debt service payment (1); Special program costs (2); Transportation (1); Instructional equipment (1)	5 (13%)
No response	1 (3%)

Note: Percentages do not total 100 because respondents were not limited to one expenditure item.

While program funding is decreasing or remaining stable, expenditures continue to rise. The school districts were asked to indicate their most rapidly growing budget items over the past four years. As indicated above, staff salaries and benefits and energy costs were among the fastest growing budget expenditures in 72% of the urban school districts. Next most frequently cited was health care, with 54% of the districts seeing growth in this budget item. Although a third (33%) indicate dollar outlays on physical plant maintenance to be rapidly on the rise, school nutrition and administrative costs were listed by only 3% and 5% of the districts, respectively.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE SOURCES

Local Revenue Options

Available	School Districts
Yes	25 (64%)
No	14 (36%)

Available Revenue Sources

Source	School Districts
Local income tax	0
Local sales tax	1
Property tax	23
Other	5

Note: Numbers do not equal 25 because a school district may have more than one optional revenue source.

Nearly two-thirds (64%) of the responding school districts had potential local revenue sources available to them. Of these 25 districts, the overwhelming majority (92%) would use property taxes as the vehicle for obtaining additional funds. Local sales tax was an option in one district, and five districts cited other sources: revenue sharing (1); local levies (2); an enrichment tax (1); and miscellaneous taxes, e.g., utility, amusement, etc. (1).

Of the 36% of school districts that had no local options for generating revenue, three were levying at the maximum millage rate, four were fiscally dependent upon local government, and four districts were restricted by state-mandated formulas.

State Revenue Options

Available	School Districts
Yes	17 (44%)
No	22 (56%)

Available Revenue Sources

Source	School Districts
State income tax	8
State sales tax	8
State property tax	1
Other	11

Note: Numbers do not equal 17 because a school district may have more than one optional revenue source.

Only 44% of the school districts had access to optional revenue sources at the state level. Approximately half of these could generate additional monies through state income and/or sales taxes. Other state sources which were specified include state aid (5), severance taxes on minerals (2), the state lottery (2), licensing fees (1) and a "Minimum Foundation Tax" (1).

All districts without revenue-producing options were restricted by state-set funding formulas. As one school district indicated, lobbying the state legislature is the only recourse for obtaining additional funds at this level.

Local and State Funding Jeopardy

Jeopardized	School Districts
Yes	28 (72%)
No	11 (28%)

Given the increasingly heavy reliance upon local and state funding sources, it is important to try to understand the stability of funding at this level. Unfortunately, 72% of the urban school districts responding to the survey indicated that their local and/or state funding is jeopardized (actually or potentially) by local and state economics. Funding for 59% of these districts is directly linked to sales and/or income taxes, however, fluctuations in the economy weigh heavily on the availability of revenues. Other funding sources are equally vulnerable: two districts depend heavily upon taxation of revenues from the energy industry, which has been depressed in recent times.

ADDRESSING FEDERAL REDUCTIONS

Legislative initiatives

Legislation for Ensuring an Equitable Distribution of Funding

Legislative initiative	School Districts
Districts should have input into the formula used at the federal level	33 (85%)
Districts should have input into the formula used at the state level	35 (90%)
It should be mandated that states send monies directly to urban districts based on their number of underprivileged, etc.	20 (51%)
Put a lid on administrative costs of programs at the federal level	12 (31%)
Put a lid on administrative costs of programs at the state level	14 (36%)
Put a lid on administrative costs of programs at the local level	6 (15%)
Add in unit costs	4 (10%)
Other: Fully-fund mandated programs (2); Return to categorical grants (1); Prohibit artificial "income caps" and deficits on earned entitlements (1); Base funding on documented urban/non-urban differences (1)	5 (13%)

Note: Percentages do not equal 100 because respondents could check more than one response.

The majority of urban school districts (90%) feel they should have input into the funding formula used at the state level. Almost as many (85%) indicate that input at the federal level is also needed. Thirty-six percent state that an equitable distribution of funding can be better ensured through capping administrative costs at the state level, while slightly fewer (31%) endorse similar legislation at the federal level.

Local Initiatives

Local Strategies for Addressing Federal Cuts

Strategy	School Districts
Forming coalitions with teachers/administrators	11 (28%)
Forming coalitions with non-educationally-based unions, associations, etc.	4 (10%)
Reaching out to or working with your congressional representatives	35 (90%)
Working with community groups, e.g., the Urban League	21 (54%)
Working with local government, e.g., City Council	16 (41%)
Working with the business community	23 (60%)
Other	12 (31%)
Not Applicable; no major impact from Federal reductions	1 (3%)

The urban districts are actively pursuing various routes for addressing federal cuts in funding. Ninety percent are working with their congressional representatives, while more than half are building and utilizing liaisons with community groups and the business community (54% and 60%, respectively). Local government ties are a source of activity in 41% of the school districts. "Other" strategies include forming coalitions with other educational groups and seeking monies from private foundations. It should be noted that most urban school districts are not implementing a single strategy, but are using the combination of techniques best suited to their particular districts.

FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION FUNDING

Role of the Federal Government in Education Funding

Role	School Districts
The Federal Government should supplement funding from local and/or state sources	30 (77%)
The Federal Government should be the major source of funding	0 (0%)
The Federal Government is primarily responsible for attending equity	13 (33%)
Other	7 (18%)

Note: Percentages do not total 100 because respondents could choose more than one response.

Thirty (77%) school districts believe that the federal government should supplement local and state funding. Nearly a third of those responding to the survey state that attending equity is primarily a federal responsibility. None, however, believe that the federal government should be the major source of education funding. Among the other roles felt to be within the federal purview are full reimbursement for mandated program costs (5), educational research and development (1) and funding for the rapidly changing technological applications in the classroom (1).

SUMMARY

Over the past few years, education funding has been de-emphasized at the federal level. Much has been said about the importance of education to the future of this country but the Administration's demonstrated actions in dollars for public education programs have been less than supportive of excellence and effectiveness. Nowhere is this approach more readily felt than in this nation's largest cities. Funding for some successful education programs has been reduced resulting in a significant decrease in their effectiveness.

A look at the survey results in this publication on the effects of federal education expenditures illustrates the federal program reductions. In 1982-83, the federal share of education budgets constituted a lower percentage than in the previous four years, averaging 4% in 34 of the 39 districts. When these decreases are considered in the context of 20% inflation over the last four years, it is clear that the burden on the urban school districts in educating their children is growing steadily heavier. For example, ECIA Chapter 1 dollars decreasd in 69% of the surveyed districts. Funding for Impact Aid has declined with 74% of the school districts receiving fewer dollars in 1982-83, many losing at least three-quarters of their funding. More than half of the districts received lower funding for Vocational Education, averaging a 29% decrease.

While program funding is decreasing, expenditures continue to rise resulting in fewer dollars being spent for the students. The fastest growing budget items were in the areas of energy costs, staff salaries and benefits and physical plant maintenance with increases in the 21-28% range.

The majority (85%) of the districts feel they should have input into the funding formula at the federal level. Ninety percent indicated that they should have input at the state level. With the decrease in federal dollars, many districts look to their states for larger shares in order to offset the federal decrease. Half of the operating costs in nineteen districts were received from the state.

The data show that there are some increases in dollars allocated to some of the programs, however, the larger dollar amount does not represent a true picture regarding the number of students served. Fewer students are presently being served than four years ago—nationally, approximately a half-million children fewer. The largest proportion of those students not being served are enrolled in urban public schools. Also, services to students participating in these programs have been reduced.

Urban districts are actively pursuing various routes for addressing federal cuts in funding. Ninety percent are working with their congressional representatives, while more than half are building and utilizing liaisons with community groups and the business community (54% and 60%, respectively). Local government ties are a source of activity in 41% of the school districts. Other strategies include forming coalitions with other educational groups and seeking monies from private foundations. Most urban school districts are not implementing a single strategy, but are using the combination of techniques best suited to their particular districts.

ABOUT NSBA

The National School Boards Association is a not-for-profit organization whose primary mission is the general advancement of education through the unique American tradition of local citizen control of, and accountability for, the nation's public schools. In this way, education policy is decided by board members who are directly accountable to the community. NSBA promotes the quality of education through services to state associations of local school boards and local school districts. It represents school boards' interests before Congress, federal education agencies and other national regulatory bodies. Active Members of NSBA include the 49 state school boards associations and the boards of education of Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Founded in 1940, NSBA represents about 97,000 of the nation's school board members who, in turn, govern the schools attended by 97 percent of all U.S. public school children.

NSBA is located in the metropolitan Washington, D.C. area at 1680 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314, 703/838-NSBA.

ABOUT THE COUNCIL OF URBAN BOARDS OF EDUCATION

The NSBA Council of Urban Boards of Education (CUBE) was established by the NSBA Board of Directors in 1967 to address the unique needs of school board members serving the largest cities of the United States.

Any school board that is a Direct Affiliate of NSBA and serves a community with a core-city population of at least 100,000 persons is eligible for membership in CUBE, as in any NSBA Direct Affiliate school board that is a member of state-level urban council in its respective state school boards association. CUBE is governed by a 13-member steering committee of urban board members.

CUBE exists to enable school board leaders to gather information, develop recommendations, and take appropriate action to improve the quality and equality of education provided in densely populated cities inhabited by people of widely varying, diverse, and heterogeneous backgrounds.

NSBA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PRESIDENT
Ted J. Comstock

FIRST VICE PRESIDENT
Mack J. Spears

SECOND VICE PRESIDENT
Nellie C. Weil

SECRETARY-TREASURER
Jonathan T. Howe

IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT
M. Joan Parent

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Thomas A. Shannon
(ex officio)

DIRECTORS
Mary E. Busch
Thomas G. Chappelear
Merlin L. Cohen
Martha C. Fricke
Loretta J. Manwaring
Paul K. McCash, Jr.
James R. Oglesby
Arlene R. Penfield
Joyce W. Rogers
Leonard Fovins
H. B. Scott
Donald A. Swanson
Daniel L. Towler
Robert G. Wilson
JoAnn S. Wimmer

EX OFFICIO
John D. O'Bryant, NSBA Council of Urban Boards of Education
Lou Ella Kleinz, NSBA State Association of Executive Directors' Liaison Committee
E. Freeman Leverett, NSBA Council of School Attorneys

ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS
James Betchkal
Don E. Blom
Jeremiah Floyd
August W. Steinhilber

STAFF LIAISON
Martharose Laffey, Assistant Executive Director, Office of Communications and Membership Relations
Sandra O. Heningburg, Director, Urban and Minority Relations Department
Jacqueline Henderson, Manager, Urban and Minority Relations Support Services

MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC STUDY COMMITTEE ON THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL CUTBACKS: WHAT HAPPENED TO NEEDED URBAN SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Clara W. Rutherford, Chairman, Detroit, MI
Jo Brown, Wichita, KS
Herb Cawthorne, Portland, OR
Franklin Hawkins, Portsmouth, VA
Sandra Kostos, Omaha, NE
Mary Rutledge, Dallas, TX
John D. O'Bryant, Boston, MA, Chairman of the Council, Ex Officio

NSBA Staff Liaison Directors:

Jeremiah Floyd, Associate Executive Director, Office of Communications and Membership Relations
Martharose Laffey, Assistant Executive Director, Public Information and Constituency Relations Section
Sandra Heningburg, Director, Urban and Minority Relations Department

COUNCIL OF URBAN BOARDS OF EDUCATION STEERING COMMITTEE 1984-85

John O'Bryant, Boston
Chairman of the Council
JoAnn Pottorff, Wichita
Vice Chairman of the Council
Eva Bacal, Tucson
Herb Cawthorne, Portland
Jean Fink, Pittsburgh
Robert Hester, Dallas
Betty Hill, Oklahoma City
Wendell P. Holmes, Jacksonville
Daniel T. Kildee, Flint
Arturo Medina, Corpus Christi
Clara W. Rutherford, Detroit
Benjamin Tom, San Francisco
Mary Busch, Indianapolis
Immediate Past Chairman
Ted J. Comstock
President, NSBA, Ex Officio
Thomas A. Shannon
Executive Director, NSBA, Ex Officio
Jeremiah Floyd
Associate Executive Director, NSBA
Martharose Laffey
Assistant Executive Director, NSBA
Sandra Heningburg
Director of Urban and Minority Relations, NSBA
Jacqueline Henderson
Manager of Urban and Minority Relations Support Services, NSBA
Kathryn Washington
Secretary, Development/Urban and Minority Relations, NSBA

MEMBER DISTRICTS NSBA'S COUNCIL OF URBAN BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Amarillo, TX
Anchorage, AK
Ann Arbor, MI
Aurora, CO
Austin, TX
Baltimore, MD
Baton Rouge, LA
Birmingham, AL
Boston, MA
Buffalo, NY
Cedar Rapids, IA
Chicago, IL
Cincinnati, OH
Cleveland, OH
Corpus Christi, TX
Dallas, TX
Dayton, OH
Denver, CO
Des Moines, IA
Detroit, MI
Flint, MI
Fort Wayne, IN
Fort Worth, TX
Fresno, CA
Grand Rapids, MI
Hampton, VA
Indianapolis, IN
Jacksonville, FL (Duval County)
Kansas City, MO
Lakewood, CO
Lincoln, NE
Louisville, KY (Jefferson County)
Memphis, TN
Miami, FL (Dade County)
Milwaukee, WI
Minneapolis, MN
Montgomery, AL
Newark, NJ
New Orleans, LA
New York, NY
Norfolk, VA
Oakland, CA
Oklahoma City, OK
Omaha, NE
Orlando, FL
Phoenix, AZ (Elementary)
Phoenix, AZ (Roosevelt)
Phoenix, AZ (Union High)
Pittsburgh, PA
Portsmouth, VA
Portland, OR
Raleigh, NC (Wake County)
Reno, NV
Richmond, VA
Riverside, CA
Rochester, NY
Sacramento, CA
Saint Louis, MO
Saint Paul, MN
Saint Petersburg, FL
San Diego, CA
San Francisco, CA
Seattle, WA
South Bend, IN
Springfield, MO
Stamford, CT
Tacoma, WA
Tampa, FL (Hillsborough County)
Toledo, OH
Tucson, AZ
Tulsa, OK
Virginia Beach, VA
Wichita, KS

THE IMPACT OF REDUCTIONS IN FEDERAL EDUCATION EXPENDITURES

Appendix

Please describe how your district is implementing or planning to implement the mandatory legislation on asbestos abatement.

Thirty-seven percent of the school districts are currently in full compliance with the mandated asbestos abatement program and indicate that they have completed removal or encapsulation of all friable asbestos. An equal number have solid efforts underway and anticipate full compliance in the future -- contingent, in some cases, upon additional funding. Five districts indicated they need financial assistance in order to initiate an active asbestos abatement program.

Funds to eliminate or contain asbestos in the schools were obtained from local sources in ten of the twelve districts that cited funding sources. State monies were used in one district, and a combination of state and local funds in another.

Ten districts specified actual dollars expended, ranging from $150,000 to $3,200,000. One district that had already spent over $2 million on asbestos abatement stated that three times this amount would be necessary to rid all schools in the district of asbestos.

Please describe how your district is implementing or planning to implement the mandatory legislation on the Illegal Alien Act.

The legislative provisions of this Act do not appear to be problematic in the urban school districts. Fifty-four percent indicated the Act would not be applicable in their districts, and an additional 27% did not respond. Only two districts discussed cooperative efforts with governmental agencies to implement the Act. One of these districts expects funding for approximately 750 students and is considering the use of computer-assisted instruction for older high school students. Anticipated funds equal $800,000.

Please describe how your district is implementing or planning to implement the mandatory legislation on handicapped barrier free access.

All districts are addressing the issue of barrier free access for handicapped students. Fifty-six percent indicate they are in full compliance with the law, and 12% have completed renovations in some of their facilities. Funds have been earmarked for necessary renovations or other access strategy; and another four districts indicated they effect accessibility as the need presents itself. Compliance is accomplished through renovations where financially feasible and through special transportation of the handicapped student in other cases. All new constructions are barrier-free.

Of the eleven districts that gave the sources of their funding, six are providing barrier free access with local dollars only. While three of the districts have obtained local, state and federal money for this program, the federal contribution is minor. State and federal funds are expended in two districts. Only four districts indicated they could differentiate costs for implementing the legislation; figures given were: $446,900, $200,000, $3,100,000 and $16,819,799.

Please describe how your district is implementing or planning to implement the mandatory legislation on desegregation.

Four urban districts indicated that implementation of desegregation orders was not applicable in their schools. Nearly 75% simply stated that they were meeting the necessary requirements, two of whom indicated that magnet schools were being developed to comply with the legislation. A third district had approval for magnet schools but could not obtain adequate funding. Loss of state block grant funds has also impeded implementation is another school district.

Although sources of funding were specified by only fourteen districts, 71% of these were effecting desegregation with local funds (supplemented to varying degrees with federal monies in two districts and state monies in another five). The state and federal governments were underwriting costs in three and one district, respectively.

Dollar figures ranged from $858,215 to $316,773,286. Three of the districts quoted implementation costs of approximately $3 Million.

FUNDING TRENDS & REVENUE SOURCES

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Relative Change Between 1979-80 and 1982-83
ECIA Chapter 1					
Baltimore, MD		25,351,406	24,353,379	24,765,153	(6)[1]
Austin, TX	3,615,083	3,885,809		3,372,441	(7)
Impact Aid, Parts A & B					
Baltimore, MD		530,000	---	---	
Austin, TX	410,664	363,596		25,019	(94)
Education for Handicapped Children					
Baltimore, MD		3,806,910	3,598,459	1,776,439	(53)[1]
Austin, TX	502,641	1,017,309		1,304,681	159
The School Nutrition Program					
Baltimore, MD		12,889,445	13,234,395	12,822,488	(1)[1]
Austin, TX	4,630,634	5,068,634		4,513,771	(3)
Vocational Education					
Baltimore, MD		1,686,160	1,870,803	1,856,029	10[1]
Austin, TX	401,325	409,877		388,627	(3)
Other Federal Programs					
Baltimore, MD		6,047,930	7,631,449	3,930,568	(35)
Austin, TX	807,911	563,786		557,864[2]	

[1]Change is between 1980-81 and 1982-83.

[2]Does not include Title IV, Parts B and C, which are included in prior years and were merged with Chapter 2 Block Grant Funds in 1982-83

Percentage Funding by Revenue Source	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	% Absolute Change between 1979-80 and 1982-83
Baltimore, MD					
Local	NR	38.0	38.0	40,0	2.0
State	NR	46.0	46.0	46.0	-0-
Federal	NR	16.0	16.0	14.0	(2.0)
Austin, TX					
Local	50.8	53.2	NR	57.2	6.4
State	45.8	43.7	NR	36.3	(9.5)
Federal	3.4	3.1	NR	6.5	3.1

RISING BUDGET EXPENDITURES

Both school districts cited staff salaries and benefits as one of their fastest growing budget items. Energy costs, administrative costs and physical plant maintenance were each listed by one of the districts.

ADDITIONAL REVENUE SOURCES

Both districts indicated that options for generating local revenues were available to them, one citing property taxes and the other naming general revenue sources.

Likewise, both school districts can potentially generate additional state revenues. Sales tax was the base for these monies in one district and "general revenue" in the other.

One district indicated these local and state funding sources to be in jeopardy due to the local/state economic situation, while the other did not.

ADDRESSING FEDERAL REDUCTIONS

Legislative Initiatives

The two districts concur that school districts should have input into the federal and state formulae used in funding educational programs. They also agree that states should send monies directly to urban districts based on the number of underprivileged, etc. As to capping administrative costs to programs, one district each indicated that lids at the federal, state, and local levels were needed.

Local Initiatives

One school district was primarily working with its business community to offset federal cuts. The other was building coalitions with teachers and administrators, as well as with non-educationally-based groups. Active involvement with congressional representatives and local government is also a strategy in this urban school district.

FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION FUNDING

Both districts believe that the federal government should supplement funding from local and state sources. Matching funds from private sources was suggested by one district as a federal responsibility, while another district indicated that special federal funds should be allocated for national educational priority areas, e.g., vocational education. Attending equity was also seen as a federal role by one district.